

AL-TP-1991-0005

AD-A237 483



DTIC

ELECTRONIC

JUN 23 1991

C



2

ARMSTRONG
LABORATORY

**POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT AS MODERATORS
OF THE JOB SATISFACTION-JOB ATTITUDES
RELATIONSHIP**

L. Alan Witt

Department of Psychology
Western Illinois University
Macomb, IL 61455

Mark N. Beorkrem

Department of Psychology
Washington University
St. Louis, MO 63130

Dee H. Andrews

**HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTORATE
AIRCREW TRAINING RESEARCH DIVISION
Williams Air Force Base, AZ 85240-6457**

June 1991

Final Technical Paper for Period June 1988 to February 1991

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

91-03606



**AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235-5000**

NOTICES

This technical paper is published as received and has not been edited by the technical editing staff of the Armstrong Laboratory.

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely Government-related procurement, the United States Government incurs no responsibility or any obligation whatsoever. The fact that the Government may have formulated or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication, or otherwise in any manner construed, as licensing the holder, or any other person or corporation; or as conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

The Office of Public Affairs has reviewed this paper, and it is releasable to the National Technical Information Service, where it will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

This paper has been reviewed and is approved for publication.



DEE H. ANDREWS, Technical Director
Aircrew Training Research Division

JOHN H. FULLER, JR., Colonel, USAF
Chief, Aircrew Training Research Division

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 1991		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final Paper - June 1988 - February 1991	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Positive and Negative Affect as Moderators of the Job Satisfaction-Job Attitudes Relationship				5. FUNDING NUMBERS PE - 62205F PR - 1123 TA - 05 WU - 01	
6. AUTHOR(S) L. Alan Witt Mark N. Beorkrem Dee H. Andrews					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Armstrong Laboratory Human Resources Directorate Aircrew Training Research Division Williams Air Force Base, AZ 85240-6457				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AL-TP-1991-0005	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES L. Alan Witt, Department of Psychology, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455 Mark N. Beorkrem, Department of Psychology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130					
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) B. R. Staw, in an article in <i>Administrative Sciences Quarterly</i> , called for a dispositional approach to the study of job attitudes, arguing that disposition or affect may supersede the influences of the situation in the formulation of job satisfaction. In assessing that position, the present experiment measured positive and negative affect, job satisfaction, and several perceptions of the work context among 76 workers at the Armstrong Laboratory, Aircrew Training Research Division, Williams Air Force Base, Arizona. Results of correlation and regression analyses show that positive and negative affect accounted for significant variance in neither job satisfaction nor the situation variables. These affects added little unique variance (over situation measures) to the prediction of job satisfaction. However, further analyses show that both positive and negative affect moderated the relationships between job satisfaction and some of the situation variables. The data provide limited support for Staw's assertion that situation-focused organization development interventions designed to promote job satisfaction may be prone to failure because they do not account for dispositional differences among employees.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS disposition dispositional approach job attitudes job satisfaction situation situational cues work setting work situation				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 24	
				16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified		18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified		19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	
				20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Dispositional Approach to Job Attitudes.....	1
Measurement of Affect.....	2
Interaction Between Situation and Disposition.....	2
The Present Experiment.....	3
II. METHOD.....	3
Participants and Procedure.....	3
Instruments Included in the Survey.....	3
Measures of affect.....	3
Measures of job satisfaction.....	3
Measures of the psychological meaning of the situation.....	4
III. RESULTS.....	4
Correlation Analyses.....	4
Regression Analyses.....	5
Differential Validity Analyses.....	6
IV. DISCUSSION.....	7
REFERENCES.....	13

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Correlations Between Positive and Negative Affect and the Situation Variables.....	5
2 Comparison of Beta Weights of Positive Affect and the Situation Variables in Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction.....	5
3 Comparison of Beta Weights of Negative Affect and the Situation Variables in Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction.....	6
4 Satisfaction-Job Attitudes Differential Validities Between Low vs. High Positive Affect Groups.....	8
5 Satisfaction-Job Attitudes Differential Validities Between Low vs. High Negative Affect Groups.....	10

PREFACE

We wish to acknowledge the personnel of the Armstrong Laboratory, Aircrew Training Research Division, who provided us with considerable assistance: Col Michael C. Lane, Lt Col Richard Drown, Lt Col Forrest Pate, Mrs Pat Spears, and Mrs Eileen Evans. We thank Mr Marv Wellik for supporting our data collection efforts among the University of Dayton Research Institute (UDRI) personnel on site at Williams Air Force Base, AZ. We greatly appreciate and thank Drs Elizabeth Martin and Dee Andrews for their conceptual feedback and significant assistance in data collection. Furthermore, we thank the Aircrew Training Research Division and UDRI personnel who took the time to carefully and completely fill out our surveys and meet with us in formal interviews.

Summary

Previous research has examined job satisfaction among Air Force personnel. Implicit in such investigations is the notion that job satisfaction is influenced primarily by situational cues. The dispositional approach to the study of job attitudes, however, suggests that job satisfaction is primarily a reflection of dispositional affect. An implication of this approach is that attempts to alter the work situation to promote job satisfaction are prone to failure. This document addresses the validity of the dispositional approach to the study of job attitudes in a sample of Armstrong Laboratory, Aircrew Training Research Division personnel.



Accession For	
ATC GRAB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Spec:	

v

A-1

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT AS MODERATORS OF THE JOB SATISFACTION-JOB ATTITUDES RELATIONSHIP

I. INTRODUCTION

Accompanying the recent explosion of research on affect (cf. Watson & Tellegen, 1985) have been an emphasis on the influence of affect on job attitudes (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985). Schneider (1987) calls for a de-emphasis on strict situationism in organizational behavior theory and research. The influence of affect in the development of job attitudes is an important issue. One implication involves job satisfaction: Does job satisfaction reflect the individual's affective disposition, response to the work situation, or is it a combination of both? If job satisfaction is primarily dispositional affect, then attempts to alter the work situation to increase job satisfaction among Air Force personnel are doomed to failure. Implicit in organization development job satisfaction interventions is the notion that job satisfaction reflects the situation. Recent work on affect challenges the accuracy of this assumption.

The Dispositional Approach to Job Attitudes

Presenting a dispositional theory of job attitudes, Staw, et al. (1986, p. 61) suggested that employees "bring a positive or negative disposition to the work setting, process information about the job in a way that is consistent with that disposition, and then experience job satisfaction or dissatisfaction as a result." They cited three separate findings to support their assertion that the formulation of task attitudes "comes as much from the internal state of the individual as from any external cues." The three findings were: (a) variation in task perceptions among persons with identical job descriptions (O'Reilly, Parlette, & Bloom, 1980), (b) positive correlations between job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Weaver, 1978) and between job attitudes and mental health (Kahn, 1981), and (c) failures of field experiments to yield long-term changes in job attitudes (Oldham & Hackman, 1980).

Weiss and Adler (1984) suggested that personality variables have not accounted for much of the variance in organizational behavior because researchers have ignored them. However, three recent studies provide evidence of the impact of dispositional factors on job satisfaction. Pulakos and Schmitt (1983) found that the instrumentalities of high school students for job-related outcomes that were measured before taking a job were predictive of later job satisfaction. Staw, et al. (1986) reported that adolescent affect correlates with adult job affect. Staw and Ross (1985) found the strongest predictor of a single, global item of job satisfaction in 1971 was job satisfaction in 1966 -- noting that changes in pay and job status were weaker predictors. They (p. 477) wrote it was difficult to conclude that "situational effects will supersede attitudinal consistency in most contexts." Considering a more recent study (Gerhart, 1987) and previous problems in operationalizing affect, we take issue with this conclusion.

Gerhart (1987) argued that the subjects in the Staw and Ross (1985) study were unlikely to experience significant changes on the job because of

their ages (45 to 59 in 1966 and 50 to 64 in 1971). He then failed to replicate Staw and Ross' (1985) findings on a younger sample, reporting that pay, occupational status, and job complexity added explanatory power to an equation predicting job satisfaction.

Two problems reduce the impact of the Gerhart (1987) and Staw and Ross (1985) studies. First, both used a single, global measure of job satisfaction. It is possible that they may have found stronger situational effects had they measured specific facets of job satisfaction. Second, neither study directly assessed affect. They inferred the relationships between affective disposition and job behaviors by assessing consistency of job attitudes or by the absence of a strong relationship between attitudes and operationalized situational variables. Staw, et al. (1986), however, constructed measures of affect post hoc from prior psychological assessments. Very recent developments in the affect literature permit direct assessment of affect.

Measurement of Affect

In studies of self-reported mood, negative and positive affect consistently have emerged as the two dominant and relatively independent dimensions (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988, p. 1063) defined these two dimensions:

Positive Affect (PA) reflects the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active, and alert. High PA is a state of high energy, full concentration, and pleasurable engagement, whereas low PA is characterized by sadness and lethargy. In contrast, Negative Affect (NA) is a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasurable engagement that subsumes a variety of aversive mood states, including anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear, and nervousness, with low NA being a state of calmness and serenity.

Reports have linked PA to social activities, satisfaction, and the frequency of pleasant events and NA to stress, poor coping mechanisms, and frequency of unpleasant events (cf. Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988; Watson, et al., 1988). An impressive research program (Clark & Watson, 1986, 1988; Watson & Clark, 1984; Watson & Tellegen, 1985) led to the development of the Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988) positive and negative affect scales (PANAS).

Interaction Between Situation and Disposition

Staw and Ross (1985) noted that future research might find certain settings arouse hostility in negatively predisposed individuals but have no effect on positively predisposed people. This argument is inconsistent with the work of Watson and his colleagues because it implies that positive and negative affectivity are at polar opposites of the same dispositional continuum. Nevertheless, the point that there is likely an interaction between affect and the context in producing job attitudes is congruent with Lewin's (1936) $B = f(P, E)$ formula. Staw and Ross (1985) correctly argued

that organizational behavior researchers have only emphasized half of the equation.

Advocates of the interactional psychology perspective (Endler & Magnusson, 1976) emphasize the interaction between the individual and situation and argue the necessity for measurement of both. Terborg (1981) suggested that: (a) cognition, motivation, and ability are the essential determinants of behavior on the person side of the interaction, and (b) the psychological meaning of situations for the individual is the determinant of behavior on the situation side of the interaction. Although we agree with the latter, we suggest that he did not emphasize an important factor on the person side of the situation, namely affect.

The Present Experiment

The studies cited above have provided initial evidence of disposition as a part of job satisfaction, and hundreds of studies have well documented the contextual influences on job satisfaction. In line with Staw and Ross' (1985) comment implying an interaction between the job situation and affect, we believe that the next step in assessing the utility of the dispositional approach to job attitudes is to measure that interaction. Therefore, in the present experiment, we examined the extent to which positive and negative affect moderated the relationships between job satisfaction and the situation. In addition, we examined the relative importance of affect and situation variables in accounting for variance in job satisfaction.

Based on Watson, et al.'s (1988) definition of positive affect, we hypothesized that measures of the psychological meaning of situations would account for greater variance in job satisfaction among employees high in positive affect. These people are more alert and engaged in the situation. We expected the same among people low in negative affect. They are more calm and serene and not as engaged in aversive mood states that might distract them from attending to situational cues.

II. METHOD

Participants and Procedure

The division chief sent a letter to ninety government and contractor workers at the Aircrew Training Research Division through the inter-office mail system requesting voluntary participation in an attached survey. Seventy-six workers returned completed questionnaires.

Instruments Included in the Survey

Measures of Affect. The Watson, et al. (1988) ten-item Positive Affect ($\alpha = .80$) and ten-item Negative Affect ($\alpha = .82$) scales measured positive and negative affect, respectively.

Measures of Job Satisfaction. A 13-item index ($\alpha = .87$) measured job satisfaction. We asked employees to indicate their satisfaction with each of the following aspects of the job situation (1 = extremely dissatisfied; 7 =

extremely satisfied): (a) the fringe benefits you receive (Schnake, 1983); (b) the amount of freedom you have on your job; (c) the chances you have to accomplish something worthwhile (Schnake, 1983); (d) your family's attitude toward your job (Hendrix, 1979); (e) the chances you have to take part in making decisions (Schnake, 1983); (f) the first work assignment you received upon arrival here; (g) the amount of job security you have (Schnake, 1983); (h) the work itself (what you do); (i) the friendliness of the people you work with (Schnake, 1983); (j) the chances you have to learn new things (Schnake, 1983); (k) the amount of pay you get (Schnake, 1983); (l) the way the people you work with treat you (Schnake, 1983); and (m) your job as a whole (Hendrix, 1979).

Measures of the Psychological Meaning of the Situation. Perceived fairness in which pay and work tasks are assigned and in which performance appraisal is conducted or "procedural justice" (Greenberg, 1987) was measured by three items ($\alpha = .71$). The Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa (1986) 5-item measure ($\alpha = .53$) measured exchange ideology. Although not a measure of the situation, it permits assessment of the individual's personal orientation toward equity. Exchange ideology refers to a dispositional orientation on the relationship between what the individual receives from the organization and what the individual will, in return, give the organization. On one end of the continuum, employees will perform congruent with organization reinforcements (for example, if treated fairly, they will work hard; if not, they will not). On the other, employees put forth effort without regard to what they receive from the organization (for example, even if they perceive themselves as being treated unfairly, they will work hard). Perceptions of organizational effectiveness measurements included four items ($\alpha = .69$); two from Hendrix (1979) and two from Romzek (1985). The revised (Schuler, Aldag, & Brief, 1977) Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) role ambiguity scale ($\alpha = .82$) and role conflict scales ($\alpha = .83$) measured role ambiguity and role conflict, respectively. The 39-item ($\alpha = .85$) climate for creative productivity index developed in the present experiment measured norms for creative work outcomes. The 30-item revised (Schnake, 1983) Litwin and Stringer (1968) Organizational Climate Questionnaire ($\alpha = .89$) measured omnibus organizational climate.

III. Results

Three sets of analyses assessed Staw's argument that affect is the primary component of job satisfaction.

Correlation Analyses

Table 1 presents the correlation coefficients of the positive and negative affect scores with scores on the other measures. As shown there, positive accounted for significant variance in overall satisfaction, satisfaction with social factors, role ambiguity, and omnibus organizational climate. Negative accounted for significant variance only in overall satisfaction and role ambiguity.

Table 1. Correlations Between Positive and Negative Affect and the Situation Variables

Situation variable	Positive affect		Negative affect	
	r	p <	r	p <
Overall ¹ satisfaction	.22	.04	-.23	.04
Satisfaction with decision-making	.03	ns ^a	-.02	ns
Satisfaction with the work itself	.16	ns	-.12	ns
Satisfaction with extrinsic factors	-.01	ns	-.12	ns
Satisfaction with initial work assignment	-.03	ns	-.06	ns
Satisfaction with social factors	.21	.04	-.11	ns
Procedural justice	.06	ns	-.12	ns
Exchange ideology	.01	ns	.12	ns
Organizational effectiveness	.07	ns	-.09	ns
Role ambiguity	-.34	.001	.21	.04
Role conflict	-.04	ns	.04	ns
Climate for creative productivity	.12	ns	-.07	ns
Omnibus organizational climate	.21	.04	-.16	ns

^a Denotes not significant

Regression Analyses

Regression analyses assessed the relative importance of positive and negative affect versus situation variables in predicting overall job satisfaction.

Table 2. Comparison of Beta Weights of Positive Affect and the Situation Variables in Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction

Situation variable	Beta of situation variable	Beta of positive affect	R2 with both predictors
1. Procedural justice	.53	.16	.30
2. Exchange ideology	.23	.11	.07
3. Perceived effectiveness	.39	.13	.17
4. Role ambiguity	-.23	.07	.07
5. Role conflict	-.20	.17	.07
6. Creativity climate	.65	.14	.44
7. Participation and rewards ^a	.57	.15	.37
8. Structure ^a	.44	.08	.23
9. Warmth and support ^a	.44	.18	.24
10. Standards ^a	.29	.18	.13
11. Responsibility ^a	.21	.21	.09
12. Overall climate	.54	.08	.30

^a Denotes a subscale of the Litwin and Stringer organizational climate questionnaire.

As shown in Table 2, the beta weights of the situation variables were substantially greater than the weights of positive affect, except for the situation variables of role conflict and perceptions of responsibility, which contributed only slightly more variance than positive affect.

As indicated by the beta weights in Table 3, all but four of the situation variables contributed substantially greater variance than did negative affect. Role ambiguity and exchange ideology contributed roughly the same amount of variance as did negative affect. However, negative affect contributed greater variance than did role conflict and perceptions of responsibility.

Table 3. Comparison of Beta Weights of Negative Affect and the Situation Variables in Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction

Situation variable	Beta of situation variable	Beta of negative affect	R2 with both predictors
1. Procedural justice	.50	-.16	.30
2. Exchange ideology	.24	-.24	.12
3. Perceived effectiveness	.27	-.19	.19
4. Role ambiguity	-.19	-.17	.09
5. Role conflict	-.16	-.31	.13
6. Creativity climate	.63	-.16	.44
7. Participation and rewards ^a	.54	-.16	.34
8. Structure ^a	.39	-.16	.21
9. Warmth and support ^a	.41	-.14	.21
10. Standards ^a	.30	-.15	.14
11. Responsibility ^a	.15	-.21	.08
12. Overall climate	.52	-.10	.31

^a Denotes a subscale of the Litwin and Stringer organizational climate questionnaire.

Although not reported here, regression analyses run for each of the job satisfaction facets produced similar results.

Differential Validity Analyses

While moderated multiple regression assesses the form of the relationship, it does not assess the degree or direction of the relationship (Arnold, 1982). Therefore, we chose to test for positive and negative affect as moderators by examining differential validities. Employee scores on the positive affect and negative scales were split on the median, creating groups low and high in positive and negative affect. We computed zero-order correlations between the scores on the job satisfaction facets and other job attitude measures for the low and high groups for both scales. We assessed differences in the correlations by Fisher Z transformation. As shown in Table 4, of a possible 72, there were 20 differential validities with Fisher Z's p

<.05, with five $p < .08$ and another three $p < .12$. The pattern of the coefficients suggests that the situation variables accounted for greater variance in satisfaction among employees in the high positive affect group than those in the low positive affect group. As shown in Table 5, of a possible 72, there were eight differential validities with Fisher Z's $p < .05$, with six $p < .08$ and another three $p < .12$. The pattern of coefficients suggests that the situation variables accounted for greater variance among employees lower in negative affect in all measures of satisfaction except for satisfaction with extrinsic factors. Given the loss of power caused by splitting positive and negative affect (continuous variables) on the median, these results are promising.

IV. Discussion

The major purpose of the present experiment was to further assess the utility of the dispositional approach to job attitudes. The data suggest that positive affect accounted for some variance in overall satisfaction, in satisfaction with social factors, and in two of the situational variables. Negative affect accounted for variance only in role ambiguity and overall satisfaction. While positive affect accounted for very little unique variance in predicting satisfaction in equations with situation variables, negative affect accounted for portions of variance in satisfaction equal to or greater than four situation variables. Based on these results, it would be very difficult to concur with Staw's (Staw & Ross, 1985; Staw, et al., 1986) argument that affect supersedes situational influences in the development of job satisfaction.

However, both positive and negative affect moderated the relationship between job satisfaction (overall and facets of) and other job attitudes. These results provide some support for Staw's contention that organization development interventions designed to alter situations without considering individual differences in affect may be prone to failure. The present data, for example, suggest that attempts to change the work climate to promote job satisfaction may be more successful among employees higher in positive affect than among those lower in positive affect. However, the Type I error rate is of concern and seriously limits the extent to which these data support the dispositional approach to job attitudes.

The results partially confirm our hypothesis and make sense in terms of positive and negative affect theory. As stated earlier, persons high in positive affect are more enthusiastic, can concentrate better, and are more pleasurable engaged in the situation. Persons low in negative affect are more calm and less engaged in aversive emotional states. The data support the notion that these people may have been more aware of their situational circumstances, and hence situational factors had greater influence on their job satisfaction.

Although the present experiment provides limited support for the dispositional approach to the investigation of job attitudes by presenting some evidence of the moderating effects of positive and negative affect, the

Table 4. Satisfaction-Job Attitudes Differential Validities Between Low vs. High Positive Affect Groups

Variables correlated		Positive affect			Positive affect						
All	Low	High	Z	p <	Variables correlated	All	Low	High	Z	p <	
<u>Overall satisfaction with</u>											
Procedural justice	.51	.51	.56	0.28	ns ^a	Procedural justice	.37	.47	.35	0.58	ns
Exchange ideology	.16	-.21	.45	2.83	.01	Exchange ideology	.02	-.40	.30	2.98	.01
Effectiveness	.44	.29	.56	1.36	ns	Effectiveness	.33	.40	.28	0.55	ns
Role ambiguity	-.39	-.30	-.46	0.76	ns	Role ambiguity	-.37	-.42	-.36	0.28	ns
Role conflict	-.18	-.09	-.31	0.96	ns	Role conflict	-.21	-.09	-.31	0.34	ns
Creativity climate	.63	.48	.76	1.97	.05	Creativity climate	.61	.47	.72	1.61	.11
Participation & rewards	.59	.46	.68	1.34	ns	Participation & rewards	.62	.60	.63	0.19	ns
Structure	.44	.30	.57	1.38	ns	Structure	.46	.43	.63	1.14	ns
Warmth and support	.44	.23	.62	1.93	.06	Warmth and support	.46	.43	.47	0.20	ns
Standards	.30	.16	.39	1.02	ns	Standards	.38	.34	.39	0.23	ns
Responsibility	.20	.07	.32	1.06	ns	Responsibility	.29	.29	.28	0.00	rs
Overall climate	.56	.39	.72	2.01	.05	Overall climate	.62	.58	.66	0.53	ns
<u>Satisfaction with the work itself with</u>											
Procedural justice	.37	.37	.38	0.00	ns	Procedural justice	.27	.21	.36	0.66	ns
Exchange ideology	.08	-.24	.30	2.25	.01	Exchange ideology	-.01	-.39	.33	3.07	.01
Effectiveness	.36	.28	.43	0.69	ns	Effectiveness	.28	.19	.35	0.70	ns
Role ambiguity	-.36	-.33	-.39	0.28	ns	Role ambiguity	-.22	-.07	-.38	1.34	ns
Role conflict	-.05	-.02	-.12	0.43	ns	Role conflict	-.22	-.20	-.26	0.22	ns
Creativity climate	.56	.35	.72	2.21	.01	Creativity climate	.51	.35	.66	1.74	.08
Participation & rewards	.56	.46	.63	0.99	ns	Participation & rewards	.52	.44	.59	0.84	ns
Structure	.44	.34	.54	1.01	ns	Structure	.25	.09	.45	1.60	.11
Warmth and support	.44	.29	.56	1.36	ns	Warmth and support	.34	.13	.57	2.10	.04
Standards	.34	.17	.45	1.27	ns	Standards	.17	-.02	.35	1.56	.12
Responsibility	.29	.16	.42	1.17	ns	Responsibility	.05	-.05	.17	0.90	ns
Overall climate	.56	.43	.68	1.50	ns	Overall climate	.45	.31	.61	1.58	.12

Table 4. Concluded

Variables correlated			Positive affect			Positive affect					
	All	Low	High	Z	p <	Variables correlated	All	Low	High	Z	p <
<u>Satisfaction with</u>											
<u>extrinsic factors with</u>											
<u>Satisfaction with</u>											
<u>initial work assignment with</u>											
Procedural justice	.51	.37	.71	2.03	.05	Procedural justice	.22	-.01	.52	2.38	.02
Exchange ideology	.27	-.12	.51	2.78	.01	Exchange ideology	.23	.19	.23	0.17	ns
Effectiveness	.25	-.12	.54	2.95	.01	Effectiveness	.35	.09	.54	2.09	.04
Role ambiguity	-.16	-.02	-.32	1.27	ns	Role ambiguity	-.30	-.06	-.39	1.43	ns
Role conflict	-.27	-.26	-.35	0.41	ns	Role conflict	-.05	-.01	-.06	0.21	ns
Creativity climate	.56	.35	.73	2.29	.01	Creativity climate	.25	-.01	.65	3.19	.01
Participation & rewards	.42	.18	.60	2.08	.04	Participation & rewards	.27	-.00	.52	2.34	.05
Structure	.19	-.02	.45	1.89	.06	Structure	.22	.06	.46	1.78	.08
Warmth and support	.26	.06	.45	1.73	.08	Warmth and support	.19	-.05	.43	2.07	.04
Standards	.12	-.02	.03	0.12	ns	Standards	.15	-.03	.30	1.38	ns
Responsibility	.06	.02	.09	0.28	ns	Responsibility	.08	-.03	.20	0.95	ns
Overall climate	.33	.09	.57	2.27	.01	Overall climate	.24	-.01	.53	2.43	.01

Note: In the low (N = 38) and high (N = 38) positive affect groups, correlations greater than .35 are p < .01, and correlations greater than .28 are p < .05. Among all subjects, correlations greater than .26 are p < .01, and correlations greater than .19 are p < .05.

^a Denotes not significant

Table 5. Satisfaction-Job Attitudes Differential Validities Between Low vs. High Negative Affect Groups

Variables correlated	Negative affect			p <	Z	p <	Negative affect			p <
	All	Low	High				All	Low	High	
<u>Overall satisfaction with</u>										
Procedural justice	.51	.54	.50	0.17	ns ^a		.37	.48	.37	0.56
Exchange ideology	.16	-.36	.06	1.83	.07		.02	-.17	-.17	1.44
Effectiveness	.44	.72	.27	2.64	.01		.33	.50	.21	1.41
Role ambiguity	-.39	-.56	-.25	1.58	.12		-.37	-.59	-.11	2.38
Role conflict	-.18	-.09	-.31	0.97	ns		-.09	-.22	-.13	0.38
Creativity climate	.63	.63	.64	0.00	ns		.61	.60	.63	0.20
Participation & rewards	.59	.72	.49	1.56	.12		.62	.69	.53	1.08
Structure	.44	.55	.35	1.06	ns		.46	.56	.35	1.12
Warmth and support	.44	.61	.29	1.72	.08		.46	.50	.41	0.47
Standards	.30	.32	.25	0.32	ns		.38	.39	.35	0.19
Responsibility	.20	.13	.26	0.56	ns		.29	.29	.29	0.00
Overall climate	.56	.68	.45	1.44	ns		.62	.67	.56	0.81
<u>Satisfaction with the work itself with</u>										
Procedural justice	.37	.39	.33	0.36	ns		.27	.43	.17	1.20
Exchange ideology	.08	.23	-.02	1.06	.01		-.01	-.16	-.15	0.00
Effectiveness	.36	.59	.21	1.95	.06		.28	.47	.12	1.63
Role ambiguity	-.36	-.58	-.17	2.05	.04		-.22	-.30	-.18	0.54
Role conflict	-.05	-.02	-.12	0.42	ns		-.22	-.20	-.26	0.22
Creativity climate	.56	.56	.57	0.00	ns		.51	.59	.48	0.65
Participation & rewards	.56	.67	.47	1.26	ns		.52	.69	.43	1.36
Structure	.44	.54	.36	0.95	ns		.25	.38	.18	0.92
Warmth and support	.44	.54	.35	0.99	ns		.34	.64	.15	2.54
Standards	.34	.36	.31	0.23	ns		.17	-.30	.07	1.59
Responsibility	.29	.21	.36	0.68	ns		.05	-.16	-.01	0.63
Overall climate	.56	.64	.49	0.93	ns		.45	.65	.33	1.80
<u>Satisfaction with social factors with</u>										
Procedural justice	.37	.39	.33	0.36	ns		.27	.43	.17	1.20
Exchange ideology	.08	.23	-.02	1.06	.01		-.01	-.16	-.15	0.00
Effectiveness	.36	.59	.21	1.95	.06		.28	.47	.12	1.63
Role ambiguity	-.36	-.58	-.17	2.05	.04		-.22	-.30	-.18	0.54
Role conflict	-.05	-.02	-.12	0.42	ns		-.22	-.20	-.26	0.22
Creativity climate	.56	.56	.57	0.00	ns		.51	.59	.48	0.65
Participation & rewards	.56	.67	.47	1.26	ns		.52	.69	.43	1.36
Structure	.44	.54	.36	0.95	ns		.25	.38	.18	0.92
Warmth and support	.44	.54	.35	0.99	ns		.34	.64	.15	2.54
Standards	.34	.36	.31	0.23	ns		.17	-.30	.07	1.59
Responsibility	.29	.21	.36	0.68	ns		.05	-.16	-.01	0.63
Overall climate	.56	.64	.49	0.93	ns		.45	.65	.33	1.80

Table 5. Concluded

Variables correlated			Negative affect			Negative affect					
	All	Low	High	Z	p <	Variables correlated	All	Low	High	Z	p <
<u>Satisfaction with</u>											
<u>extrinsic factors with</u>											
<u>Satisfaction with</u>											
<u>initial work assignment with</u>											
Procedural justice	.51	.42	.55	0.71	ns	Procedural justice	.22	.25	.20	0.22	ns
Exchange ideology	.27	.36	.26	0.46	ns	Exchange ideology	.23	.19	.23	0.18	ns
Effectiveness	.25	.34	.19	0.67	ns	Effectiveness	.35	.49	.25	1.17	.04
Role ambiguity	-.16	-.25	-.08	0.73	ns	Role ambiguity	-.30	-.40	.05	1.98	.05
Role conflict	-.27	-.25	-.35	0.46	ns	Role conflict	.05	-.01	.05	0.25	ns
Creativity climate	.56	.54	.62	0.51	ns	Creativity climate	??	.41	.38	0.15	ns
Participation & rewards	.42	.38	.46	0.40	ns	Participation & rewards	.27	.27	.27	0.00	ns
Structure	.19	.22	.16	0.26	ns	Structure	.22	.25	.20	0.21	ns
Warmth and support	.26	.24	.27	0.13	.08	Warmth and support	.19	.20	.18	0.00	ns
Standards	.12	-.14	.35	2.11	.04	Standards	.15	.02	.28	1.12	ns
Responsibility	.06	-.10	.17	1.13	ns	Responsibility	.08	-.16	.28	1.87	.06
Overall climate	.33	.30	.35	0.23	ns	Overall climate	.24	.23	.26	0.13	ns

Note: In the low (N = 38) and high (N = 38) negative affect groups, correlations greater than .39 are p < .01, and correlations greater than .28 are p < .05. Among all subjects, correlations greater than .26 are p < .01, and correlations greater than .19 are p < .05.

^a Denotes not significant

data clearly indicate the inaccuracy of the notion that affect supersedes situational influences in the formulation of job satisfaction. Indeed, the present experiment supports the utility of previous Air Force efforts to measure job satisfaction and subsequent attempts to alter the work environment when needed. Future research efforts might include measurement of affect among Air Force personnel to further assess the influence of dispositional affect on job satisfaction. As noted by Staw, et al. (1986), future assessments of the dispositional approach to job satisfaction require evidence of temporal stability of job attitudes and evidence of cross-situational consistency. We suggest that person-situation interaction needs to have additional evidence.

References

- Arnold, H. J. (1982). Moderator variables: A clarification of conceptual, analytic, and psychometric issues. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 29, 143-174.
- Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B. S., & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 193-198.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1986, August). Diurnal variation in mood: Interaction with daily events and personality. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1988). Mood and the mundane: Relations between daily life events and self-reported mood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 296-308.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 500-507.
- Endler, N. S. & Magnusson, D. (1976). Toward an interactional psychology of personality. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 956-974.
- Gerhart, B. (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction? Implications for job design and other personnel programs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 366-373.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 55-61.
- Hendrix, W. H. (1979). Organizational assessment indices of effectiveness. (AFHRL-TR-79-49, AD-A079 777). Brooks Air Force Base, TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.
- Kahn, R. L. (1981). Work and health. New York: Wiley.
- Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Harvard University.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (1980). Work design in the organizational context. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 247-278). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- O'Reilly, C. A. Parlette, N., & Bloom, J. R. (1980). Perceptual measures of task characteristics: The biasing effects of differing frames of reference and job attitudes. Academy of Management Journal, 23, 118-137.

- Pulakos, E. D., & Schmitt, N. (1983). A longitudinal study of a valence model approach for the prediction of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 307-312.
- Rizzo, J., R., House, R., J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 150-163.
- Romzek, B. S. (1985). Perceptions of agency effectiveness as the basis for differences in organizational involvement: A research note. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 6, 76-85.
- Schnake, M. E. (1983). An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate. Personnel Psychology, 36, 791-807.
- Schneider, B. (1987). People make the place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 437-453.
- Schuler, R. S., Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A. P. (1977). Role conflict and ambiguity: A scale analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20, 111-128.
- Staw, B. R., Bell, N. E. & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 31, 56-77.
- Staw, B. R., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 469-480.
- Terborg, J. R. (1981). Interactional psychology and research on human behavior in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 6, 569-576.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. Psychological Bulletin, 96, 465-490.
- Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. Psychological Bulletin, 98, 219-235.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 1063-1070.
- Weaver, C. N. (1978). Job satisfaction as a component of happiness among males and females. Personnel Psychology, 31, 831-840.
- Weiss, H. M., & Adler, J. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 6, pp. 1-50). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.